The MILITANT

Semi-Monthly Organ of the Communist League of America (Opposition)

VOL. II. No. 11 | NEW YORK, N. Y. July 1, 1929. | PRICE 5 CENTS

GASTONIA

The eyes of all enlightened workers must turn today to Gastonia, North Carolina, the scene of the first great battle for the unionization of the South and the attempt to halt this work by the time-honored method of murder frame-up against nearly a score of the strike leaders headed by Fred Beal. The attempt to railroad the strike leaders is the outcome of the raid on the strikers' tent colony on June 7 which resulted in the fatal shooting of the chief of police, the leader of the raid. This raid, with its tragic consequences, was the culmination of weeks of provocation, Czarist oppresion and lynch law invoked against the strikers by the authorities under the control of the mill owners.

That fatalities did not occur sooner is proof of the restraint and discipline of the workers. That finally, after they had been starved, beaten, evicted and driven into a tent colony they fought back in self defense is testimony to their courage which all class conscious workers will applaud. Gastonia has written its name already on the bright pages of American labor history. The workers there have fought and are fighting not for themselves alone but for the cause of all the expoited who aspire to organization and freedom. Their support and defense is a duty of the American working class. It must become a burning issue of the labor movement.

The unionization of the newly industrialized South, proceeding through blood and fire, is a work of profound importance for the future of our labor movement. Every step forward in this field has a strengthening and invigorating influence all around. These workers must not be compelled to fight alone. Widespread, national support is the duty of the hour.

The Communists, the most dynamic element in the working class, have played their part in the vanguard of the battle at Gastonia. In contradistinction to reformist neglect and treachery they have fought at the head of the struggle of the workers. Experience here again shows that it is the revolutionaries who fight most aggressively and courageously for the smallest reforms in the conditions of the workers.

But the Communists cannot and should not wage this fight alone. And the newly industrialized Southern workers must not be separated from the older and better organized workers of the north, not even from those who only partly understand the issues at stake. This will only isolate the struggle and condemn it to defeat. The issue of Gastonia has become a national issue which cries out for the formation of the broadest possible supporting movement. The local struggle must become a national struggle and gain the support of the working class. The advancement of unionization among the Southern workers and the lives of the arrested strikers and strike leaders depend on this.

For the development of this struggle on a national scale and on a broad basis all sectarianism must be cast aside. All efforts must be directed toward the mobilization of all conscious and progressive forces in the working class and all sympathetic elements around the communists for the help of the Gastonia workers. Any other policy is hopelessly futile, against the interests of the workers and condemned in advance to defeat.

Our way is clearly indicated by the experience of previous struggles as well as by the relation of forces and the tested fighting methods of communism. The management of the Passaic strike, despite minor erors was a brilliant exemplification of these methods which must be revived and emulated in the present situation. The Communists at the head of that historic struggle utilized the tactics of the united front with brilliant success. Thereby a broad supporting movement was created in which great masses of non-communist workers took part, along with the sympathizing and liberal elements whose aid in the circumstances was very valuable. The Passaic strike conferences throughout the country which provided the material and moral reserves of support for the striking workers at Passaic, and the methods whereby they were created, are good examples for our guiding line now.

The great Sacco-Vanzetti agitation is another excellent example of how the Communists, despite their numerical weakness and lack of direct influence over the masses, are able by correct tactics to organize hundreds of thousands of workers and set them into motion on a class issue. The Communists, as the decisive element in the International Labor Defense, were indubitably the leading and organizing force in this vast campaign. If this had been done at the start of the fight Sacco and Vanzetti would have been saved. The key to the successful work of mobilization in the Sacco-Vanzetti case as in the Passaic strike consisted in subordinating names and forms to the movement, in appearing as the defenders of the general interests of the workers and not simply of partisan aims and in the organization of non-communists and even anti-communist workers for the struggle on that ground. These methods alone made the movement possible and indirectly brought a hundred times more credit and prestige to the Communists than could have been gained by any ballyhoo of self-praise.

All this holds good in the present struggle. Nothing has happened in the meantime except to confirm this truth. The extent to which this is realized and applied in practice will have a decisive bearing on the scope and effectiveness of the struggle for Gastonia.

IN THIS ISSUE

THE FIGHT FOR GASTONIA
LOVESTONE IS EXPELLED
BRITISH LABOR GOVERNMENT
TROTSKY ON RADEK
THE PROGRESSIVE CONFERENCE
MAY DAY PUTSCH IN BERLIN
REVOLUTION IN INDIA
BEHIND THE SCENES IN THE RUSSIAN PARTY
LOSOVSKY VERSUS LOSOVSKY

New Split Begins

Lovestone is Expelled

The falling apart of the Right-Center Bloc in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the International is already finding its inevitable expression in the Communist Party of the United States. Jay Lovestone, yesterday the leader of the Party and comrade-in-arms of Foster in the war against the Communist Opposition, has been expelled by the new Political Bureau manufactured recently in Moscow. At the same time, Bertram D. Wolfe was suspended from the Political Bureau of which he was a member. These actions, together with similar ones to follow, were already evident from the tone and content of the spurious "enlightenment campaign" carried on in the Party press since the receipt of the "open address" of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. They represent the beginning of a new split in the Party.

Lovestone-Wolfe-Gitlow and Company are undoubtedly leading a split away from the Party to the Right, the logical conclusion of their whole past course of petty-bourgeois corruption and opportunism, a course in which they were continuously supported by the Stalin Executive Committee of the Communist International. They are obviously allied with the Right Wing in the International, led by Bucharin, Rykov and their faction. They will undoubtedly bring forward a Brandler platform of tactics for the American movement which will clash with the new "left" policy of the party all along the line. The Lovestone faction is strongly entrenched in the party apparatus and in the leading circles of the Needle Trades group of opportunists, and is already waging an effective internal struggle of factionalism and sabotage against the decision of the C. I. and the new "leadership" made to order by it. At the opportune moment Lovestone and Wolfe will be able to deal a heavy blow in the open.

The "enlightenment campaign" throws no light whatever on the actual processes at work and only prepares the ground for deeper convulsions. Its explanation of the new events is false and superficial from start to finish. What is taking place in the American Communist Party, as in the Communist International as a whole, is the splitting of the movement, the disintegration of its forces, the smashing of its prestige and recruiting powers among the workers. We are witnessing the culmination in the American Party of the disruptive influence of Stalinist centrism on the International movement. Only those who understand this can help the movement back to the path of Lenin.

Organization measures, suppression and falsification — the sole weapons of the newly appointed leaders — cannot cope with the disintegration. They only strengthen and deepen it. They sow pessimism and discouragement in the ranks. The Party members vote without understanding or conviction in the vain hope for peace and unity while the whole situation matures new and fiercer factional struggles. Stalinism has led the Party to a blind alley, disrupted it from within and weakened it enormously before its enemies.

Formal discipline as a cover for political impotence and bureaucratic rule has played itself out. Organization measures have lost their effectiveness. The only salvation of the movement lies in ideological clarification and a reunification of the communist ranks on that basis. The communist workers need to know what is really behind the crisis, to think and to act with conscious purpose. The cablegram leadership, without political strength, without independence, without ability and without courage cannot create the conditions for this. The communist workers will win their way to a Leninist understanding of the situation only in revolt against them.

The party needs a real discussion of the three conflicting political lines which are now clearly revealing themselves: The Right, the Centrist and the line of the Communist Opposition. The Party needs to smash through the artificial limits of the fake "enlightenment campaign" and compel a real political discussion of the issues and the viewpoints. This is the way out of the crisis. This is the way to the consolidation of the prole... ...unist forces and a ... ...ife for the

Banquet for Balbo - Exile for Trotsky

The anti-Fascist movement in this country, and in the rest of the world, is experiencing a tumultous discusion and dissension. The subject involved is the report that Teruci, chief of the Fascist militia and Italo Balbo, one of the most notorious hangmen of Fascism, and Minister of Airways in Italy, upon his arrival with an airplane squadron of Fascisti in Odessa, U. S. S. R., was given an enthusiastic reception by the Soviet authorities. According to the United Press reports. Balbo and his fellow blackshirts had a banquet tendered to them in Odessa which was attended by the official head of the Soviet Air Fleet and other notables.

Thousands of the best sons of Italian labor were murdered, assaulted and imprisoned by Mussolini's butchers. It is Italo Balbo whose name is an imprecation on the lips of every Italian proletarian. It was he who ordered the murder of the anti-Fascist priest, Don Minzoni, for which he was tried and released. It was he who has the blood of scores of Italian revolutionists on his hands. Wherever he goes he is pursued by the curses of the working class. When he came to Argentina some time ago, the demonstrations of the workers against him raised such a commotion that two of them were killed by the reactionaries. In New York City, when Balbo came here he was met with a demonstration of infuriated workers at the City Hall, at the Plaza Hotel and at the dock when he sailed. Many of the Italian workers in the city felt the clubs of the Tammany Hall police who protected Balbo. In Greece and Bulgaria through which he has just passed, no reception was accorded him.

After the death of the martyred Matteotti, a session of the League of Nations in Geneva took place, during which Mussolini came forward with outstretched palm to Emile Vandervelde, the Belgian social patriotic prime minister. Vandervelde said: "I don't give my hand to Matteotti's murderer." Even the yellow social democ... ...ndervelde did not dare to shake the hand of blo... ...the fury of the workers.

But Stalin ... ...ble to give Italo Balbo ... reception ... ...the comrade of Lenin, for a leader of the Bolshevik Revolution, for a founder and leader of the victorious Red Army, for a founder and leader of the Communist International — Stalin has only imprisonment and exile in Siberia and deportation to the White Guards in Turkey.

PARTY MEMBERS PROTEST BALBO'S RECEPTION

On Friday, June 21, 1929, at the district membership meeting of the Itallian comrades in New York and vicinity at the Workers Center, the question of the Russian reception to the famous fascist murderer, Italo Balbo, was heatedly discussed for hours. Many of the Itallian comrades protested against the action of the Stalin regime, the most energetic voice of condemnation being raised by comrade Mainelli, of Union City, New Jersey. When he declared: "It was shameful to receive Balbo!" he expressed the feelings of numerous Itallian comrades who have had to hang their heads and be unable to reply to the taunts of the yellow socialists and anti-Party Italian press in New York, which has raised a hue and cry about the Balbo reception.

PICNIC

arranged by the

New York Branch of the Communist League of America

in PALISADES PARK, N. J.

ON SUNDAY, JULY 14th

Directions: Take Fort Lee Ferry at W. 130th St. On the Jersey side take Hudson River car to Dalia Boulevard. From Dalia Blvd. ten minutes walk to end of Seventh St., Palisades Park. From the Jersey side of Fort Lee Ferry auto service from 9. A. M. to 2 P. M.

— There will be eats, ... and fun —

TICKETS 25 C...

A Letter on the Capitulators

Dear Friend:

The latest press despatches tell of a journey of Preobrazhensky to Moscow for negotiations with the Central Committee. There is not the slightest doubt that these capitulators and compromisers of the third draft will be made fools of. Of what participation in the Party different from that of Zinoviev are they dreaming? Branded as a capitulator, Zinoviev sits in silence, afraid to move, not knowing what to expect. We, meanwhile, are actively, though slowly, preparing the future, forming the cadres of young Bolsheviks. What position between us and the Zinovievists do the new capitulators expect to occupy? It is doubtful if they themselves have any clear idea of that. They have the hope that Yaroslavsky will purge their brains, after which they will have to crawl out of the swamp onto a clean spot, by no means increasing their authority.

I. They assert that the disagreements have almost disappeared. How do they explain the rabid character of the repressions? Exile, and hard-labor prisons for Bolsheviks in the absence of very deep and irreconciliable disagreements, could only be the result of a completely unprincipled bureaucratic banditism. That is just the policy of the Stalinists, if you take the point of view of Radek and others. But in that case, how do they dare murmur of a union with these political bandits who, without grounds in principle, are imprisoning our comrades in hard-labor prisons condemning them to banishment, and sometimes to death?

WHAT CAPITULATION MEANS.

We never characterized the Stalinists so mercilessly and annihilatingly as Radek does, against his will, as a result of the mere fact that he has got lost in this forest of three trees, crawls out, falls again, scrambles away, tries to get up, and falls down again. We have thought, and we still think, that the Stalinists are not unthinking political bandits, for they have profound and principled reasons for their merciless persecution of us. It is a poor statesman who takes a political line in short fragments, not asking himself what elements are carrying out that line and for what reasons. Having got into an economic blind alley, the Stalinist cadres, gritting their teeth, are carrying out a left zig-zag, which by force of circumstances and of the struggle itself has carried them much farther to the left than they wished. Nine-tenths of those cadres are dreaming of getting back at the first opportunity upon a more "healthy", "normal", "national" line, and hate us mortally exactly because by our uncompromising attitude we prevent their doing it. A capitulation of the Opposition would mean: a) condemning ourselves to a Zinovievist vegetable existence — nature knows no more shameful thing, and b) an immediate swerving of the Stalinists to the right.

II. The question of the Comintern does not in the least interest the advocates of capitulation "in one country". The national-socialistic program of the Comintern worries them very little. They reconcile themselves with light hearts to the policy of adventurism which, in Berlin as in Canton, is designed to restore the revolutionary reputation of Centrism. Meanwhile the continued persecution of the Opposition is hopelessly decomposing the cadres of the Comintern. Everything is being trampled and defiled by the boot of bureaucratism. How shall we heal this affliction? It is quite simple: capitulate before that same boot!

III. A revolution is a mighty devourer of people. In the older generation there is an immense percentage of devastated souls among the ruling majority — and no small percentage among the Opposition. The reaction is in full course in the Party and the Comintern, reflecting the general swing of class forces on a world scale. In such circumstances withdrawals and capitulations inevitably stand on the order of the day. Bolshevism from 1907 to 1910, and again from 1914 to 1917, passed through a whole series of such departures, splittings off groupings and individual capitulations. Only by way of such self-cleansings and self-clarifyings could it have grown and strengthened for the October victory. We are not in the least frightened by the withdrawal of comrades, even those with the most "respected" names. By the example of their waverings we will teach steadfastness to the young.

THE USE OF THE BOURGEOIS PRESS.

IV. What a pitiful and cowardly falsity is the "Yes-yes" of these new capitulators to Yaroslavsky and company, in regard to the impermissibility of employing the bourgeois press. Was it necessary to stoop to such triviality? Through T. A. S. S. (the official press agency of the Soviet Union. — Ed.) the Stalinists are propagating in the bourgeois press of the whole world a monstrous lie and slander against us, gradually preparing a justification for measures of blood repression. And we must not dare tell the truth about ourselves in that same press?!! The Stalinists dicker with the bourgeois police and with the reactionary diplomats to prevent our admission into one country. They compel the Norwegian Communists together with the reaction to destroy the right of asylum. They compel the official Communist press to accompany this reactionary police work with wild persecution and slander, which creeps into the pages of the whole bourgeois press. And we must modestly and sweetly keep silent, obedient to a resolution of the year 1905 which was adapted to the conditions of a revolutionary Party, and not to the reactionary work of a Thermidorian bureaucracy attacking us in sacred union with the capitalist police of all Europe!

One thing is clear: we have the perspective before us of long stubborn struggle and work of education. We must renew our ranks. Let those withdraw who are not strong enough for this work. Some of them, having wandered and wavered, will come back to us. And we by then will be stronger. We must prepare to replace them in the spirit of adamantine Bolshevik irreconcilibility. Along with the work among the masses on the basis of our platform, we must deepen our work of educating the youth, not sparing our strength even to win one person. We need a deepened propaganda on a world scale. Every serious Bolshevik ought to have around him several young people, leading them from day to day into the sphere of the fundamental questions of Marxism and the international revolution.

Constantinople, May 23, 1929. **L. D. TROTSKY.**

IN THE NEXT ISSUE: A letter just received from comrade Trotsky on "Radek and the Opposition", dealing also with the reply of comrade Trotsky written in exile at Alma-Ata to the thesis of Radek.

THE MILITANT

Published twice a month by the Communist League of America (Opposition)

Address all mail to: P. O. Box 120, Madison Square Station, New York, N. Y.

Publisher's address at 332 East 18th Street, New York, N. Y.

Subscription rate: $1.00 per year. Foreign, $1.50

5c. per copy Bundle rates, 3c. per copy.

Editor
James P. Cannon

Associate Editors:
Martin Abern
Max Shachtman
Maurice Spector

VOL. II. JULY 1, 1929 No. 11.

Entered as second-class mail matter November 28, 1928, at the Post Office at N. Y., under the act of March 3, 79

THE PROGRESSIVES MEET

This "Conference for Progressive Labor Action" was more a sympton of the processes at work than an event of importance in itself. It will not shake the throne of a single king of trade union reaction or even upset the swivel chair of any of its lower mercenaries. Nevertheless it has an importance for those who examine the happenings of today in the light of the dynamic forces making for future changes — that is to say, for the Marxists. Not even a confab of progressive windjammers happens without cause. The development of the new progressive movement is following the line of the analysis and forecast of our Platform just as precisely as it is confuting the Party Convention theses of both groups of the squabbling bureaucrats which were concerned only with the attempt to adapt themselves to the latest zig-zag of Stalin Centrism in the Comintern rather than with an analysis of the actualities of the American movement and inferences proceeding from such an analysis.

The holding of the progressive conference and the attempt to give the movement a national form and an organizing center are evidence that the half-conscious revolt in the labor ranks against the paralyzing rule of the black reactionaries is growing. The conference was above all an expression of this movement from below. This is the outstanding fact, and those who do not understand it, who try to dispose of the whole affair with sophomoric denunciation and childish misrepresentation — the Daily Worker's contribution — will never be able to undertsand anything. First of all it is necessary to see and understand the movement from below and then seek the tactic whereby its development along the line of effective struggle and revolutionary understanding may be facilitated.

SOCIALISTS AT THE CONFERENCE

The Socialists appeared at the conference as the directing element — discreetly behind the scenes for the most part, it is true, but more or less in charge of things and working like a well organized steering committee whenever the proceedings lagged or the pre-aranged program encountered obstacles. This also is an important fact. The emergence of those heroes with paper swords in their hands on the field against Green, Woll and Company, after years of skulking subservience in their train, represents a change in the appearence of things. They are being blown to the front by the wind of a new movement in the workers' ranks. The stupid tactics of the Communist Party only clear the way for them and thereby help to prevent the new movement from developing its real implications of struggle. The "new line" of the socialists serves to strengthen their position just as the "new line" of the Communists serves to weaken and isolate them. These simple and obvious facts stand out above a bale of theses.

The "Conference for Progressive Labor Action" is not ahead of the workers' movement it seeks to represent but behind it. The movement has impulses toward militancy. These leaders in the main dampen this spirit and hold back the struggles. The atmosphere of their conferences was thick with caution, timidity and fear. The solemn warning of Norman Thomas that the demand for a labor party is "too radical for the labor men" although he himself of course is heartily in favor of it,—a sentiment echoed by his socialist confreres — is an indication of the rabbit-like boldness of these latter-day warriors against reaction.

ROLE OF PROGRESSIVE LEADERS.

They aim to strike a balance between the awakening workers and the A. F. L. officialdom which will reconcile their co-existence and leave a dignified place for themselves as "leaders" of a sort. It is their policy to be radical enough in talk to catch the sentiment of the discontented worker, and to be conservative and cowardly enough in action to dodge any real clash with the reactionaries. The removal of Calhoun, himself a pink-hued liberal confusionist, from the teaching staff of Brookwood College, on the heels of the conference, was meant to mollify Woll and Green and convince them that the Muste progressives do not really mean to fight them.

In all this the progressives run true to form. Such contradiction between words and deeds, such confusion and cowardice, are the very essence of "progressivism" in its leading staff. All this should be known in advance and taken for granted by Communists. It is only those who have placed too much confidence in th[illegible]o will suffer from disapointment.

But what about the movement they express which is indubitably a growing one? — this is the question. How can it be broadened and developed, how can it be steered away from reformist stultification into the path of class struggle and the influence of the revolutionaries expanded? In our opinion it would be a grave error for the revolutionaries to stand aloof from it. As the movement takes shape locally and in separate unions the Communists should penetrate it and force it to the left. The fact that the progressive leaders do not want this "help" and that the socialist party elements especially will try by all means to prevent it, is no serious argument against such a tactic. This attitude of the progressive leaders only facilitates the exposure of their fraudulant claims before the workers and helps to prepare the ground for the consolidation of a more aggresive leadership and the strengthening of the position of the revolutionary elements.

FALSE TACTICS OF THE PARTY.

Their game is only aided by the tactic of barking at the movement from the sidelines of isolation. Such a course which the Party is now following is not only wrong and futile from a tactical standpoint. It is a direct repudiation of the tactics elaborated by the Second, Third and Fourth Congresses of the Communist International and applied in practice throughout the years of its growth and progress.

Unfortunately the Official Communist Party is on this false path today. Our Party, like the other sections of the C. I., is being forced into all kinds of ultra-left idiocies to "make good" for the crimes of Stalin opportunism in the Anglo-Russian Committee and the menshevik policy in the Chinese revolution. The present policy of "having nothing to do with the progressives" is just as wrong as the game of subordinating everything to them and supporting them without criticism which was played until a short time ago. The rabid and senseless leftism of today resulted from the opportunism of yesterday and will be followed tomorrow by another swing to the right. This is Stalinist Politics.

The catastrophic results of the current infantilism are already foreshadowed in the growing isolation of the Party and the weakening of its position. The entire movement of radical labor will suffer for this policy, perhaps for years to come. The policy of the Party is directly against the interests of the unfolding workers' movement. The trend of events will make this all too clear as it is already clear to those who apply the criteria of Leninist tactics.

PLAIN TALK NEEDED.

Silence in the face of these enormous errors, or lackey-like acquiesence in them has nothing in common with revolutionary duty. Such an attitude befits only religious cretins who register approval of all decrees from "above" automatically and in advance, or soul-less place-hunters on the make. Fewer decrees, fewer hypocritical endorsements and confessions, less automatic hand raising; more honest thought and plain outspoken talk—this is what the Communist movement and the whole radical workers' movement of America needs.

It is now time to check the new line of phrase-mongering leftism against experience and draw the balance against it. Tre revolutionary proletarian wing of the Party must foresee the cumulative harm which a persistence in this course will bring and begin now a stubborn and determined fight to change it. An honest, conscientious fight for Leninist policy on a single important question, such as the trade union question, will inevitably lead its protagonists into the general communist struggle against the whole regime of bureaucratic centrism. The broader the scope of this fight and the swifter its tempo the sooner will the errors be corrected and the Communist ranks be united on the line of Leninism.

NOTE

The publication of the report sent in by Comrade Konikov of the shoe strike situation in Boston has been unavoidably delayed on account of the conference material. Comrade Celia Cooperstein is active on the Executive Strike Committee. Comrade I. Cooperstein and Comrade Kleinfield of Chelsea have been active as pickets. The Stalinites have followed their usual tactics of first trying to get mech[illegible]ontrol of the movement and when the[illegible] to disrupt it. Details of the lesson[illegible] follow in the next issue.

The British Labor Government

By Maurice Spector

The results of the British general election could occasion little surprise. The series of preceding bye-elections had clearly indicated the fate of the Baldwin Government. Its record had been so obviously reactionary, its treatment of the working class so provocatory, (the suppression of the miners and the general strikes, the rupture with the USSR, the imperialist expedition to suppress the Chinese revolutionary movement, the repressive anti-trade union act, and the naval parity conflict with the United States), that a second Labor Government or Liberal Labor coalition was logically to be expected.

The British working class has been moving steadily leftward since the end of the war under the circumstance of the loss of British economic supremacy to the United States and powerful challenge of industrial competition on all sides in a consistently shrinking world market. The lords of British finance and industry have abandoned their pre-war conciliatory attitude to the trade union movement and have sought to maintain their pace in a world of increasing competition and rationalization, by applying the screws to the working class. In recent years and particularly under the Baldwin regime, the capitalist attacks on the workers have grown in scope and provocation, and the masses have reacted in turn by a more rapid pace of radicalization.

The Labor Party has reaped the harvest of this growing working class rebelliousness. The experiment of the first labor government may have "unmasked" MacDonaldism to the officials of the British Communist Party, but certainly not to the workers as a whole. Capitalist public opinion has extended the MacDonald Cabinet a very cordial welcome. It realizes that there is little to fear of "socialist experiments" from this Labor Government of extreme Right Wing Trade Union Bureaucrats and Liberals still reeking of their "apostacy" to Lloyd George. MacDonald did not even think it necessary to make concessions to the pseudo-lefts of the I. L. P. Maxton school, who pass so many resolutions for "socialism in our time". Shaw, Clynes, Henderson, Sankey, Jowett, and their like will prove the same sturdy defenders of British Imperialism in Egypt and India they always have been. The maintenance of the Empire is a point of cardinal policy in the platform of MacDonald. That means "continuity" in the repression of the subject nationalities of the Empire by coercive means if necessary.

The MacDonald Program.

The program of the MacDonald government is the program of liberalism, dressed up in the shreds and tatters of socialist phraseology. The recognition of Russia would eventually have been carried out by the Conservatives under pressure of their own industrialist delegations to Moscow, and is equally a demand of the Lloyd George Party. The hand that MacDonald extends to the USSR will not be to cement such a class accord as there would exist between two Workers Governments, because MacDonald is not the head of a Workers Government. The capital levy the only demand in the former Labor Party election platforms that threatened a serious clash with capital, has been dropped. Instead of nationalization of the mines and other industries, by the promise of which the masses were rallied to the Labor Party, what will be fostered is the Melchett-Turner scheme of rationalization on the basis of private property. It remains to be seen if there will be any repeal of the Trade Union Act of the Baldwin Government which outlawed the general strike and made mass picketing a crime. MacDonald and the whole labor bureaucracy are as much opposed to the General Strike as Baldwin or Churchill, and if this reactionary legislation hamstringing trade unionism is repealed, it will only be under the most threatening pressure of the masses.

The social reformists in the United States bubbled over with delight at this latest "victory for socialism". The Magdeburg Congress of the German social democratic party sent a telegram of greetings to MacDonald. But so far as the working class is concerned the victory of the laborites in England means as much "socialism" as the presence of the social democrats in the German coalition Government. That is, it means nothing for socialism and everything for the support of a "democracy" which is the camouflage for capitalism. The "peace-loving" German social democracy in convention assembled has just endorsed the action of its cabinet ministers in voting for a cruiser program. MacDonald is busy embracing the notorious Dawes and there is a great hue and cry about the impending settlement of the difficult problems arising from naval competition between the British and American empires. But it is in the nature of the whole position MacDonald and the liberalized Labor Party take to the Empire, that his "pacifism" cannot be more than a vain gesture. The danger of war arises not from the naval race but from the necessities of the capitalist-imperialist struggle for markets. Even if an accord of absolute naval parity could be reached, this does not settle the problem of military supremacy. How does MacDonaldism propose to "disarm" the American monopolies, their appetites just getting whetted for export trade, and basing themselves on the greatest system of mass production in the world, from capturing markets from the British?

The Defeat of the Communists.

How did the Communists fare in the election? The opportunity for appealing to the masses on a revolutionary program were never before in British history so favorable yet it must be recorded that the vote of 50,000 the Communists drew, constitutes a resounding defeat for our party. There is no sense in sweetening the pill. We are under no political or financial obligations to Stalin that necessitate soft-pedaling on the lessons of the election. It is tr[illegible] f recent years the methods of analysis of the Stalinized Executives, 'Agit-Props' and Press, of the Comintern have become very simple, that is, when the Communist Party suffers a defeat all you need do is to lie about it and shout that it was really a victory, but this was not the method of the Lenin Comintern. Thus latterly the Thaelmann-led German Communist Party was isolated in connection with the May Day events, the "red shop stewards" that had been elected proved broken reeds, the Red Front was proscribed, the "general strike", the party officialdom called, to which 50,000 in the whole country responded, was a terrible fiasco, the sub sequent Saxony elections registered Communist losses, but the Stalinites everywhere hail all this as a series of phenomenal successes that elevate the struggle to a "higher plane". But even downright falsification is unable to serve the Daily Worker and Freiheit for concealing the extent of the defeat of the British party.

How does it come about that at a time when the British masses are admittedly moving leftwards and being radicalized and subjected to rationalization, the Communists are unable to elect a single representative? It is not enough to use another frequent Stalinite alibi and say the social-democrats and the bourgeoisie were against us. That, we believe, is the reason for the existence of a Communist Party. The reason is to be found in the fact that the enormous prestige and resources of the Soviet Government, the Soviet Trade Union Movement, the CPSU and the Comintern have since the Fifth Congress, four years ago, been thrown not on the side of developing and consolidating a revolutionary Communist Party to take advantage of the sharpening clas struggle; these were thrown on the side of the reformist trade union bureaucracy thru the agency of the Anglo-Russian Committee. This Committee was held up by Stalin and Bucharin as the real center for the organization of resistance to the war danger. To the exigencies of maintaining this bloc was sacrificed the independence of the Communist Party, which was utterly submerged in the General strike, and which at first even refused to criticise the betrayers of the strike. In the interests of this Anglo-Russian Committee, Tomsky agreed to recognize the fakers of the British General Council as the sole spokesmen of the British trade union movement, and the Minority Movement was a parade of windy speech making and inocuous resolutions. It is ridiculous to assert that Purcell, Hicks and their fellows were "unmasked" by the communists even after the event, when the Stalin-Tomsky-Bucharin bloc sought at all costs, including the surrender of principle, to maintain their relations with the British labor bureaucracy.

When you have followed such a consistent opportunist line for years you cannot suddenly turn around and repair the damage with dramatic ultra left gestures. There was nothing in the preceding conduct of the Communist Party to prepare the workers to follow its latest "new line" with conviction The workers saw the spectacle of the Central Committee of the Party itself at one time wide open on the question of an independent electoral policy. The Stalin policy is primarily responsible for the disastrous showing of the British Communists in the election. The slogan of "Class against Class" which they parroted with the French Stalinites, fell on deaf ears. Had the communists carried out the line indicated for them in Trotsky's Whither England written before the General Strike, the leftward movement of the British working class would not have been directed as it has been, chiefly into the channels of parlamentary reformism.

Revolutionary Perspectives in India

A LETTER TO TROTSKY

By F. Dingelstaedt.

Kansk, July 8, 1928.

Dear Comrade Leo Davidovitch:

At the suggestion of V. I decided to communicate to you in writing some of my thoughts on the perspectives of the proletarian revolution in India. Unfortunately, the scarceness of reliable documents and their very poor quality do not permit the establishment of sufficiently decisive conclusions. It goes without saying that the official English statistics have not set themselves the task of facilitating a Marxist analysis in the study of the social and economic situation in India. So far as the works that have appeared up to now are concerned, they suffer from so many faults from the methodological point of view, or else they are so tendencious, that they are of very little use to our purpose. An exception among all the works dealing with India can perhaps be made of some books by Professor Schack, who calls himself a Marxist, and of Professor Narain, who keeps clear of anything approaching Marxism. Of further account as very interesting sources of factual material are the conscientious studies of Dr. Mann, G. Glater and K. K. Das.

Upon my request, some comrades selected a part of the books that I collected and sent them to you. It is only unfortunate that after the house-searchings such a disorder was brought into my books that certain things were lost. As for me, they categorically refused to let me go through the house to put my personal affairs in order (as I requested). As a result I cannot at all guarantee that the selection of books on India sent to you corresponds with your desires. My brother has forwarded to me certain works, among them many interesting official Reports: if you want them I will send them to you by mail.

THE NATURE OF INDIAN INDUSTRY.

To grasp the kernel of the question, it must first of all be pointed out that despite its incredible backwardness from the point of view of the disproportion between agriculture and industry, India is a country of concentrated, advanced and in part highly developed capitalism (despite certain negative sides).

Indian industry developed onesidedly in the field of textiles; its proletariat is still strongly bound to the land; the unity of the proletariat is extraordinarily hampered by tribal differences, by religious and caste prejudices; nevertheless, as the experience of the last ten years has shown, the industrial proletariat constitutes an ever growing class force. To this day it is passing through a period of spontaneous movement, insufficiently conscious, corresponding somewhat to our period before 1905. It is still difficult to say with what speed it will be able to work out the necessary subjective factors for revolutionary action: its class vanguard, the Party, its traditions and its class program. But the circumstances in which the Indian proletariat is developing are such as to justify the hope for an unusually rapid rise to class maturity.

By comparing the various figures of the official census of 1921, I have arrived at approximately the following schema of the class composition of the Indian population:

	In Millions
1. PROLETARIAT.	
Industrial workers	2.65
Miners	54
Transport [illegible]	
Plantation Workers	1.29
	8.57
	.57
Servants	4.57
Unskilled Workers (navvies, stevedores, etc.)	9.58
Land Workers and Day Laborers	37.92
Total	**60.84**
II. INDEPENDENT SMALL PRODUCERS.	
Husbandmen (petty proprietors and farmers: middle peasants and above all the poor peasants)	173.00
Breeders, Fishermen, Market-gardners, gardners hunters	7.11
Artisans	30.29
Total	**210.52**
III. GROUPS "OUTSIDE THE CLASSES".	
Army and Police	2.18
Beggars and Prostitudes	3.25
Total	**5.43**
IV. BOURGEOISIE.	
Large and Middle Landowners, Kulaks	10.72
Merchants (including the small ones)	18.12
Industrialists	83
"Liberal" Professions	5.02
Officials	4.69
Rentiers ("coupon-clippers")	.48
Total	**39.26**
Grand Total	**31[illegible]**

This table acquires its significance only wh its vital social content is penetrated. It is the second group (the independent small producers) that is specially important. So far as the husbandmen are concerned, they constitute for the most part an economically weak section of the peasantry that is being gradually ruined from year to year by the large landowners and the officials. The position of the artisans is no better: they are the half-famished descendants of a class that was once much more numerous and flourishing in ancient India.

PROLETARIA MUST LEAD THE STRUGGLE.

The desperate situation of the main mass of the agrarian population of the country, with the existence of relatively large numbers of workers, (who are very strongly represented in the country), suggests the urgent necessity of the revolutionary alliance of the workers and the peasants, but under the condition that the proletariat, organized in a class party, independent, having its own existence and program, has the hegemony. No one can prove now that cetrain "special" conditions exist in India, that not the proletariat, but some other class, can lead the great masses of the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie in the struggle against imperialism.

Thence the clear conclusion that to dilute the revolutionary proletarian vanguard, to deprive its program and its slogans of the purity of class principles, is simply to injure the work of the proletarian revolution in India.

That is just why one cannot agree with those who defend the necessity of organizing a workers' and peasants' party in India (Stalin), and not a workers' party. In my recently published book "The Agrarian Question in India", I lay stress in great detail on the problem of the Indian revolution from the viewpoint of the solution to give to the ticklish questions of the agriculture of this cuntry.

F. Dingelstaedt

THE DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE COMINTERN

(CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS ISSUE).

6. THE QUESTION OF THE CHARACTER OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION.

The slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat which leads behind it the rural poor is inseparably bound up with the question of the Socialist character of the coming, third revolution in China. And inasmuch as not only history, but also mistakes which people make in meeting its requirements, repeat themselves, we can already hear the objection raised that China has not yet matured for a Socialist revolution. But this is an abstract and lifeless formulation of the question. Has Russia, if isolated from the rest of the world, matured for Socialism? According to Lenin it has not. It has matured for the dictatorship of the proletariat as the only method of solution of national problems which cannot be delayed.

But the general destiny of the dictatorship as a whole is in the final analysis determined by the trend of world development, which, of course, does not exclude but presupposes a correct policy on the part of the proletarian dictatorship, the consolidation and development of the workers' and peasants' alliance, flexible adaptation to national conditions on the one hand, and the trend of world development on the other. This fully holds good also for China. In the same article "As to Our Revolution" (January 16, 1923) in which Lenin establishes that the peculiarity of Russia lies in the fact that it proceeds along the lines of the peculiar development of the Eastern countries, he dubs as "endlessly hackneyed" the argument of European Social Democracy to the effect "that we have not developed enough for Socialism, that we have not, as some 'learned' gentlemen say, the necessary objective economic prerequisites for Socialism". But Lenin ridicules the "learned" gentlemen not because he himself believes in the existence of the necessary economic prerequisites for Socialism in Russia but because he holds that from the absence of these prerequisites necessary for an INDEPENDENT construction of Socialism it does not at all follow, as the pedants and philistines think, that the idea of the conquest of power has to be rejected. In that article Lenin for the hundred and first or perhaps for the thousand and first time replies to the sophisms of the heroes of the Second International:

> "This INCONTROVERTIBLE consideration (about the immaturity of Russia for Socialism)... is not decisive in an evaluation of our revolution." (Volume 18, part 2, page 118 and 119).

That is what the authors of the draft program will not and cannot understand. Notice that the argument about the economic and cultural immaturity of China as well as Russia—China of course more so than Russia—is incontrovertible. But from here it does not in the least follow that the proletariat has to give up the idea of capturing power, which capture is dictated by the whole historical position and revolutionary situation in the country.

The concrete historical, political and actual question is not whether China has economically ripened for Socialism, but whether she has ripened politically for the proletarian dictatorship. These two questions are not by any means identical. They might have been identical were it not for the fact that we have a law of uneven development. That is where the law holds good and fully applies to the inter-relationships between economics and politics. Thus, has China matured for a proletarian dictatorship? Only the progress of the struggle can give a categoric answer to this question. Likewise only the struggle can settle the question as to when and under what conditions will the real unification, emancipation and regeneration of China take place. Anyone who says that China has not ripened for the dictatorship of the proletariat declares thereby that the third Chinese revolution is postponed for many years.

Of course matters would be quite hopeless if feudal survivals would really DOMINATE in Chinese economics, as the resolution of the E.C.C.I. asserts. But unfortunately, SURVIVALS in general cannot dominate. The draft program also on this point does not rectify the committed errors, but repeats them in a roundabout and loose manner. The draft speaks of the "predominance of feudal medieval relations both in the economics of the country as well as in the political superstructure..." This is fundamentally wrong. What does PREDOMINATE mean? Is it by the number of people involved? Or it it by the dominant and leading role in the economics of the country? The extraordinarily rapid growth of home industry on the basis of the all-embracing role of merchant and bank capital—complete dependence of the chief agrarian districts on the market, enormous and ever-growing foreign trade, all around subordination of the Chinese villages to the towns—goes to show the unconditional predominance, the direct sway of capitalist relations in China. Serf and semi-serf relations are undeniably very strong. They have originated partly in the days of feudalism, they partly constitute a new formation which regenerates the old on the basis of the retarded development of the productive forces, the surplus agrarian population, the activities of merchants' and usurers' capital, etc. However, not "feudal" (more correctly, serf and, generally, pre-capitalist) relations DOMINATE but capitalist relations. Only thanks to this unconditional role of capitalist relations can we speak seriously of the prospects of proletarian hegemony in the national revolution. Otherwise we find that the different ends do not meet.

The role of the Chinese proletariat in production is already very great. In the next few years it will increase still further. Its political role, as events have shown, could have been gigantic. But the policy of the leadership was, as has been shown, entirely directed against the capture of a leading role by the proletariat.

The draft program says that successful Socialist construction is possible in China "only on condition of direct support from countries under the proletarian dictatorship." Thus, here, in relation to China, the same principle is recognized which the Party always, recognized in regard to Russia. But if China has no sufficient inner forces for an INDEPENDENT construction of Socialist society then, according to the theory of Stalin and Bucharin, the Chinese proletariat should not take power in any of the stages of the Revolution. Or perhaps the existence of the U.S.S.R. settles the question otherwise? Then it follows that our technique is sufficient to build up a Socialist society not only here in the U.S.S.R., but also in China, viz., in the two economically most backward big countries. Or perhaps the inevitable dictatorship of the proletariat in China is "admissable" because that dictatorship will be included in the chain of the world-wide Socialist revolution thus becoming not only its link, but its driving force? But this is precisely Lenin's main idea in relation to the October Revolution, the "peculiarity" of which lies precisely along the lines of development of the Eastern countries. We see thus how the revisionist theory of Socialism in one country evolved in 1925 in the struggle against "Trotskyism" confuses and muddles up matters in approaching any new big revolutionary problem.

The draft program goes still further along these lines. It distinguishes China and India from "Russia of 1917, Poland ('etc.'?) as countries with a certain MINIMUM of industry sufficient for successful Socialist construction" or (which is more definitely and therefore more erroneously stated elsewhere) as countries possessing the "necessary and sufficient material prerequisites . . . for the complete construction of Socialism." Here as we already know there is a mere word play on Lenin's expression "necessary and sufficient" prerequisites, a false and inadmissable play because Lenin definitely enumerates the political and organizational prerequisites, including the TECHNICAL, CULTURAL AND INTERNATIONAL prerequisites. But the other chief point is HOW can one decide **a priori** whether a "MINIMUM OF INDUSTRY" is sufficient for the complete building up of Socialism once it is a question of an uninterrupted world struggle between two economic systems, two social orders, of which our ECONOMIC basis is in this struggle immeasurably weaker?

If we take the economic lever only, it is clear that we in the U.S.S.R., and particularly so in China and India, are sitting on the incomparably "shorter" end than world capitalism. But the whole question is determined by the REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE between the two systems on a world scale. The political long end of the lever is ON OUR SIDE, or, to speak more correctly, must be in our hands, provided we pursue a correct political line.

In the same article "As to Our Revolution", after the words that "a certain cultural level is necessary for the establishment of Socialism", Lenin remarks: "Although no one can tell exactly what this certain cultural level might be." Why can no one tell? Because the question is settled by the struggle, by the competition between the two social systems and the two cultures, ON AN INTERNATIONAL SCALE. Fully departing from this idea of Lenin's, which follows from the very substance of the question, the draft program declares that Russia had in 1917 precisely the "minimum technique" and hence also the culture necessary for the building up of Socialism in one country. The authors of the draft are trying to say in the program that which "no one can say" **a priori.**

It is impossible, one cannot, and it is stupid to seek a criterion for the "sufficient minimum" within national statics ("Russia prior to 1917") when the whole question is decided by international dynamics. In this [illegible] and isolated na- [illegible] of na-

tional narrow-mindedness in politics, the prerequisite for inevitable national reformist and social patriotic blunders in the future.

7. ON THE REACTIONARY IDEA OF WORKERS' AND PEASANTS' PARTIES FOR THE EAST.

The lesson of the second Chinese Revolution is a lesson for the entire Comintern, first and foremost for all Eastern countries.

All arguments brought forward in defense of the Menshevik policy in the Chinese Revolution must, if we take them for what they are worth, be held trebly good for India. The imperialist yoke has in India, in that classic colony, immeasurably higher palpable forms than in China. The survivals of feudal and serf relations in India are immeasurably deeper and greater. Nevertheless, or, more correctly, precisely because of that, the methods applied in China which undermined the revolution must result in India in even more destructive consequences. To abolish Indian serfdom and overthrow the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy and British militarism is a thing which can be accomplished only by a gigantic and irresistible mass movement of the people, and precisely because of its powerful sweep and irresistibility, its international purposes and relationships, it will not tolerate any half-way and compromising opportunist measures on the part of the leadership.

The Comintern leadership has already made not a few mistakes in India. Conditions have not yet allowed these errors to reveal themselves on such a scale as in China. It is, therefore, to be hoped that the lessons of the Chinese events will straighten out in good time the line of the leading policy in India and in other Eastern countries.

The central question for us here, as everywhere and always, is the question of the Communist Party, its complete independence, its irreconcilable class character. The greatest danger on this path is constituted by the organization of so-called "Workers' and Peasants' Parties" in the Eastern countries.

In 1924, a year which will be regarded as a year of open revision of a series of fundamental ideas of Marx and Lenin, Stalin advanced the idea of "dual composition of Workers' and Peasants' Parties" for the Eastern countries. It was based on the same ground of national oppression. Cables from India, as well as from Japan, where there is no national oppression, have of late frequently reported about activities of provincial "Workers' and Peasants' Parties" as of organizations which are related, and friendly to the Comintern, as if they were almost our "own" organizations, without, however, giving a more or less concrete statement as to their political physiognomy; in a word, it is exactly what has not so very long ago been written about the Kuomintang. The least dubiousness in this sphere is destructive. It is a question here of an absolutely new, entirely false and thoroughly un-Marxian orientation on the main question of the Party and of its relations to the class and the classes.

The necessity for the Communist Party of China to be affiliated with the Kuomintang was defended on the ground that the social composition of the Kuomintang was a Party of workers and peasants, that nine-tenths of the Kuomintang—this figure was repeated hundreds of times—belong to the revolutionary elements and are ready to march hand in hand with the Communist Party. However, during and since the **coups d'Etat** in Shanghai and Wuchang, these revolutionary nine-tenths of the Kuomintang have disappeared. No one has as yet found their traces. And the theoreticians of class collaboration in China, Stalin, Bucharin and others, have not even taken the trouble to explain what has become of the workers and peasants, the revolutionary, friendly and entirely our "own" nine-tenths of the Kuomintang membership. However, an answer to this question is of decisive importance if we are to understand in the future the fate of all these "dual composition" parties and have a clear idea of their very conception which throws us back far behind not only the program of the C.P.S.U. of 1919, but even the manifesto of the Communist Party of 1847.

The question as to what has become of the celebrated nine-tenths becomes clear to us only if we understand, first, the impossibility of a dual composition, that is, a dual class Party, expressing simultaneously two mutually exclusive historical lines —the proletarian and petty-bourgeois lines,—secondly, the impossibility to have in capitalist society an independent peasant party, that is, a party independent of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

Marxism has always taught, and that was accepted by Bolshevism, that the peasantry and the proletariat are two different classes, that every identification of their interests in capitalist society is false, and that the peasant can join the Communist Party if, from the property viewpoint, he adopts the views of the proletariat. An alliance of the workers a[illegible] with proletarian

A Criticism of Fundamentals - By L. D. TROTSKY

dictatorship does not do away with this fact, but confirms it, only in a different way, and under different circumstances. Were it not for the fact that they are DIFFERENT classes and have DIFFERENT interests, there would be no need for AN ALLIANCE. Such an alliance is compatible with the Socialist revolution only inasmuch as it exists within the iron frame of the proletarian dictatorship. In our country a dictatorship is incompatible with the existence of a so-called Peasant League precisely because every "independent" peasant organization with its own national political objects would inevitably be found to be an instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

Those organizations which in capitalist countries are known as Peasant Parties are in reality a peculiar type of bourgeois party. The peasant who has not accepted the proletarian position in view of his private property will inevitably look towards the bourgeoisie when it comes to fundamental political issues. Of course, any bourgeois party that relies or wants to rely on the peasantry, and, if possible, on the workers, is compelled to masquerade, that is, to create the impression that it consists of two or three different component parts. The celebrated idea of the "Workers' and Peasants' Parties" it would seem, has been purposely created to camouflage the bourgeois parties which must seek support from the peasantry and are even ready to have in their ranks also workers. The Kuomintang has from now on forever entered the annals of history as a classic type of such a party.

Bourgeois society as is known, is so built that the propertyless, discontented and deceived masses are at the bottom and the contented and the fakers are at the top. On the same principle is also built every bourgeois party, if it is a real party, that is, if it has in its ranks considerable masses. The exploiters, fakers and violators are in the minority in class society, every capitalist party is therefore compelled in its internal relations, in one way or another, to reproduce or reflect the relations of bourgeois society in its entirety. In every mass bourgeois party the lower ranks are therefore more democratic and more radical than the leaders. This is true of the German Center, the German liberals, and particularly the German Social Democrats. That is why the constant complaints voiced by Stalin, Bucharin and others that the leaders did not reflect the sentiments of the "Left" Kuomintang rank and file, the "overwhelming majority", the "nine-tenths", etc., etc., were so unpardonably naive. That which was regarded as a temporary disagreeable misunderstanding which must be eliminated by means of organizational measures, instructions and circulars, is in reality a fundamental and basic feature of any bourgeois party, particularly in a revolutionary epoch.

It is from this angle that the chief argument of the authors of the draft program in defense of all kinds of opportunist blocs in general—in England or China—must be viewed. According to them fraternization with the leaders is done exclusively in the interests of the rank and file. The Opposition, as is known, insisted on a withdrawal from the Kuomintang:

> "The question arises," says Bucharin, "why? Is it because the leaders of the Kuomintang vacillated? And what about the Kuomintang masses, are they mere 'cattle'? Since when is the attitude to a mass organisation determined by what is done by its leaders?" (The Present Situation in the Chinese Revolution)

The very possibility of such an argument seems impossible in a revolutionary party. Bucharin asks "And what about the Kuomintang masses, are they mere cattle?" Of course they are cattle. The masses of any bourgeois party are always cattle, although in different degrees. For us, the masses are not cattle. They are not cattle, and that is precisely why we do not drive them to the bourgeoisie, CAMOUFLAGING THE BOURGEOISIE BY MEANS OF A WORKERS' AND PEASANTS' PARTY. That is precisely why we must not try to subordinate the proletarian party to the bourgeoisie, but on the contrary, must at every step, set up one against the other. The leaders of the Kuomintang of whom Bucharin speaks so ironically, as of some secondary, accidental and temporary event, are in reality the soul of the Kuomintang, its social substance. Of course the bourgeoisie constitutes only the "top" in the Party as well as in society, but this top has capital, knowledge, connection; it can always fall back on the imperialists for support, and what is more it has actual political military power which directly merges with power in the Kuomintang itself. Precisely this top wrote laws against strikes, throttled the movement of the peasants, got the Communists into a dark corner, and, at best, allowed them to be only one-third of the Party, took an oath from them that petty-bourgeois Sun Yat Senism is for them above Marxism. The rank and file were picked; they served it, like Moscow, as a "Left" support, just as the generals, compradores and imperialists served it as a Right support. To consider the Kuomintang not as a BOURGEOIS PARTY, but as a NEUTRAL ARENA OF STRUGGLE FOR THE MASSES, to play on nine-tenths of the Left bourgeoisie in order to conceal the question as to who is the real master, meant to add strength and power to the leaders, to help them to convert ever larger numbers into "cattle", and, under favorable conditions, to prepare the Shanghai **coup d'Etat.** Based on the reactionary idea of the dual composition of the Party, Stalin and Bucharin imagined that the Communists together with the "Lefts" will secure a majority in the Kuomintang and thereby power in the country, as in China power was in the hands of the Kuo-

mintang. In other words, they imagined that by means of ordinary elections at a Kuomintang Congress power would pass over from the bourgeoisie to the proletariat. Can one imagine a more idealistic idolization of "party democracy" . . . in relation to a bourgeois party? It must be understood that the army, the bureaucracy, the press, and capital are in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Precisely because of this it already has leadership in the governing party. The bourgeois "top" tolerates or tolerated "nine-tenths" of the Lefts, and SUCH KIND of Lefts, inasmuch as they did not venture to tackle the army, the bureaucracy, the press and their capital. By this powerful means the bourgeois top holds in subjection not only the so-called nine-tenths of the "Left" Party members, but also the masses in general. The theory of class alliance, the theory that the Kuomintang is a workers' and peasants' party, is the best the bourgeoisie hopes for. When the bourgeoisie later meets face to face with the hostility of the masses and shoots them down, in this clash of two real forces, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, there is not even a whisper heard of the celebrated nine-tenths. The pitiful democratic fiction disappears without a trace in face of the bloody reality of the class struggle.

Such is the real and only possible political mechanism of the "dual composition Workers' and Peasants' Parties for the East." There is no other and there will not be.

* * *

Although the idea of dual composition parties is motivated on national oppression, as if this neutralizes Marx' class doctrine, we have heard already about "Workers' and Peasants' " bagatelles in Japan where there is no national oppression at all. Moreover, this is not limited merely to the East. The "dual composition" idea is endeavoring to become universal. The most caricature-like character in this respect was assumed by the Workers' Party of America in its efforts to support the candidature of the bourgeois, "anti-Trust" Senator La Follette, so as to attach, in this manner, the American farmers to the wheel of the Social Revolution. Pepper, the theoretician of the manoeuvre, who is one of those who has ruined the Hungarian Revolution and who failed to notice the Hungarian peasantry, made here a great effort to ruin the Workers' Party in its first stages of activity. Pepper's theory was that the super-profit of American capitalism converts the American proletariat into a world labor aristocracy while the agrarian crisis ruins the farmers and drives them onto the path of social revolution. A party of several thousand members, consisting chiefly of immigrants, had, according to Pepper, to make make common cause with the farmers through a bourgeois party and form a dual composition party, insuring thus the social revolution with the passivity or neutrality of the proletariat which has been corrupted by super-profits. This confused idea had its followers and half followers among the leaders of the Comintern. In the course of a few weeks the scales vacillated from one side to the other until finally a concession was made to the letter of Marxism. Having been taken off its feet the American Party had to be cut off from the noose of the La Follette party which died even before its founder.

What modern revisionism invents for the East is carried over to the West. If Pepper tried across the Atlantic to whip up history by means of a dual composition party in the United States, the latest information tells us that the Kuomintang experience finds its supporters in Italy where they are endeavoring to force on our Party the monstrous slogan of a "Republican Assembly on the Basis (?) of Workers' and Peasants' Committees". In this slogan the spirit of Chiang Kai-shek embraces the spirit of Hilferding. Will we really come to that?

* * *

In closing, we only have to recall that the idea of a "Workers' and Peasants' Party" discards from the history of Bolshevism the entire struggle against the Narodniki, without which there would have been no Bolshevik Party. What was the essence of that historical struggle? Lenin wrote about the S. R.s in 1909, the following :

> "The general idea of their program was not that an alliance of the forces' of the proletariat and peasantry is necessary, but that THERE IS NO CLASS DIFFERENCE between the two, that there is no need to draw a class distinction between them, that the Social Democratic idea concerning the petty-bourgeois character of the peasantry in contradistinction to the proletariat is fundamentally wrong." (Vol. 11, Part 1, page 198).

In other words, the dual composition Workers' and Peasants' Party was the central idea of the Russian Narodniki. Only in the struggle against this idea could the Party of the proletarian vanguard in peasant Russia develop.

Lenin insistently and persistently repeated in the epoch of the 1905 revolution, that:

> "Distrust the peasantry, ORGANIZE SEPARATELY FROM THEM, be ready for a struggle against them, inasmuch as the peasants are a reactionary or anti-proletarian force." (Vol. 6, page 113. Our emphasis).

In 1906 Lenin wrote:

> "The last advice is, proletarians and semi-proletarians of town and country, organize separately. Do not trust any possessors, even those small ones, even though they 'labor'... We support the peasant movement to the end, but we must remember that it is a movement of another class, not the class which can or will accomplish the social revolution." (Vol 9. page 410).

This idea can be found in hundreds of the larger and smaller works of Lenin. In 1908, he said:

> "The alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry, we will remark in passing, must by no means be understood in the sense of a MERGING OF THE DIFFERENT CLASSES OR PARTIES of the proletariat and the peasantry. Not only merging, but even ANY PROLONGED CONCORDANCE would be detrimental for the socialist revolution of the working class and would weaken the revolutionary democratic struggle." (Vol. 11, Part 1, page 79. Our emphasis).

Is it possible to condemn the very idea of a Workers' and Peasants' Party more sharply, more ruthlessly and more effectively?

Lenin puts the question in the same irreconcilable spirit also in the epoch of the October Revolution. In generalizing the experiences of the third Russian revolution, Lenin, beginning with 1918, does not miss a single opportunity to repeat that in a society where capitalist relations predominate there are only two decisive forces—the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

> "If the peasant does not follow the workers, he follows the bourgeoisie. There is and there can be no middle course." (Vol. 16, page 290).

However, the "Workers' and Peasants' Party" is an attempt at the creation of a middle course.

If the vanguard of the Russian proletariat had not stood up distinctly against the peasantry, if it had not waged a ruthless struggle against the petty-bourgeois looseness of the latter, it would inevitably have itself been dissolved among the petty-bourgeois elements through the S R.s or some other "dual composition" Party which, in turn, would itself inevitably have been subordinated to a bourgeois leadership. In order to arrive at a revolutionary alliance with the peasantry—this is not attained so easily—it is first of all necessary to separate the proletarian vanguard and thereby the working class as a whole, from the petty-bourgeois masses. This can be attained only by means of training the proletarian party in the spirit of staunch class irreconciliability. The newer the proletariat, the fresher and more direct its "blood relationships" with the peasantry, the greater becomes the importance of the struggle against any forms of the "dual composition" political alchemy. In the West the idea of a Workers' and Peasants Party is simply ridiculous. In the East it is ruinous. In China, India and Japan this idea is deadly hostile not only to the hegemony of the proletariat and the revolution, but to the most elementary independence of the proletarian vanguard. The Workers' and Peasants' Party can only be a basis, a cover, a spring-board for the bourgeoisie.

Fatalistically also, in this fundamental question for the East, modern revisionism only repeats the errors of pre-revolutionary Social Democratic opportunism. Most of the leaders of European Social Democracy considered the struggle of our Party against the S. R.s a mistake and insistently urged the merging of the two parties, holding that for the Russian "East" a dual composition Workers' and Peasants' Party is just the thing. Had we taken their advice we would have never realized the alliance of the workers and peasants nor the dictatorship of the proletariat. The "dual composition" Workers' and Peasants' Party of the S.R.s became, and could not help becoming in our country, an agency of the imperialist bourgeoisie, that is, it tried without success, to fulfil the same historical mission in a different and "peculiar" way that the Kuomintang successfully fulfilled in China. Without containing a relentless condemnation of the very idea of Workers' and Peasants' Parties for the East, there is not and there cannot be a Comintern program.

(CONTINUED IN NEXT ISSUE)

Behind the Scenes in the Russian Party

Dear Comrades:

We are sending you the latest information received about the situation created within and around the Political Bureau. We guarantee absolutely the exactness of this information, verified for the most part in two or three different ways. Many of the remarks reported are cited literally.

The report of the conversation of Kamenev and Bucharin (see The Militant, March 15, 1929) was published on January 20th. This document hastened the clash in the upper circles; it stunned the lower ranks. In making it public, we spoiled the game of combinations by Zinoviev and Kamenev. The Political Bureau met. . . for three days on this subject. They quarelled over it finally. The Stalin fraction decided to eliminate Bucharin, Tomsky and Rykov from the Political Bureau at the next Plenum. The Rights are preparing a passive resistance. The Stalinists are crowing: they have achieved a complete and easy victory. Our (the Opposition's) leaflet was republished by the Central Committee, for everyone said: We learn of what is happening from the leaflets of the Opposition and not from the Central Committee. The political significance of this leaflet and its popularity among the masses is immense. Everyone says: Yes, the Party is being led blind-folded! As a result of all this, the Political Bureau and the presidium of the Central Control Commission instituted a quite formal trial of the "trio". We give some details on this matter.

Bucharin's Air Journey.

In December-January, Kamenev met Bucharin quite often at Piatakov's. Bucharin said the following about the preparations for the forthcoming Plenum: "The disposition of our forces before the Plenum was such that I was in Kislovodsk writing articles for Pravda, Rykov had to worry about economy, while Uglanov, who felt very belligerent, was told to remain quiet so as not to give Stalin any excuse for interfering in the Moscow organization. Uglanov could not stand it, came forward at the 9th Plenum of the Moscow Committee, was beaten and, losing his head, said stupid things about his alleged errors, etc., etc. I learned that Rykov had finished his thesis on the control figures for the Plenum. I considered that Stalin would twist Rykov around his finger in the Political Bureau and make the already unfortunate thesis still worse. Since I could not attend the next session of the Political Bureau if I took the train, I left by airplane. We landed in Rostov. The local authorities met me with suspicious talk about the harm that might overtake me in a continued air flight, etc., etc. I sent them to the devil. We flew on. In Artemovsk we landed again. I had hardly left the cabin when I was handed a sealed packet, a cipher dispatch from the Political Bureau, ordering me categorically to discontinue my flight—because of my weak heart! I had hardly made myself known than agents of the G. P. U. led the aviator away somewhere and before me stood a delegation of workers who asked me to make a report. I asked when the next train left. It appeared that there wasn't any for 24 hours. I had to make the report."

Kamenev: "Then it is you who wrote the resolution on the struggle against the Right deviation?"

Bucharin and Tomsky Resign.

Bucharin: "Of course I did. I had to show the Party that I was not a Right winger. I arrived in Moscow Friday; the session of the Political Bureau had taken place Thursday. I went through the theses; they were obviously unsatisfactory, and I asked for the convocation of the Political Bureau. Molotov wouldn't agree, abused me, cried that I prevented harmonious work, that I should take care of my health, and more of the same. The Political Bureau was called together. I succeded in putting through a number of amendments but in spite of that the resolution still remains elastic. We drew a balance: the Moscow organization was ruined, we decided to force the offensive; we formulated 11 eleven paragraphs of demands for the removal of the Stalin people. When these demands were shown Stalin, he declared: There isn't a single point that cannot be realized. A commission was chosen (Rykov, Bucharin, Stalin, Molotov, Ordjonikidze . One day passed, a second, a third. Stalin did not call together the commission. The Plenum of the Central Committee opened. The first report is discussed, the second is about to be passed by. In the form of an ultimatum we demanded the convocation of the commission. When it met Stalin cried that he would not permit one single person to keep a whole Plenum from working. What kind of ultimatums are these; why should Krumin be removed?, etc., etc. I became angry, told him a few sharp things to his face and ran out of the room. In the corridor I met Tovstucha to whom I handed my previously prepared letter announcing the resignation of Tomsky and myself. Stalin came after me. Tovstucha handed him my declaration. He read it through and went back. Rykov told us later that his hands trembled; he was pale and expressed the desire to make concessions. He demanded that the declaration announcing my resignation be destroyed. They promised then to dismiss Kostrov, Krumin and someone else. But I did not go to the Plenum again".

Bucharin's Platform and Kamenev's!

Hereupon Bucharin showed Kamenev a document of 16 pages that he had written wherein he estimated the economic situation. According to Kamenev this document was more to the right than the April 1925 theses of Bucharin.

Kamenev asked: "What do you think of doing with this document?"

Bucharin answered: "I will supplement it with a chapter on the International situation and finish it with the question of the inner-Party situation."

"But that would be a platform?" asked Kamenev.

"Perhaps, but haven't you also written platforms?"

Here Piatakov intervened in the [illegible]tion by declaring: "I would urgently advise you not to come out against Stalin who has the majority behind him. (The majority of functionaries of the type of Piatakov and worse!) Past experience teaches us that such steps end badly." (An argument remarkable for its cynicism.)

To this Bucharin replied: "Of course, this is true, but what shall we do?" (Poor Bucharin!)

Whom Piatakov Will Obey.

After Bucharin had left, Kamenev asked Piatakov why he gave such advice which would only prevent the struggle from developing. Piatakov answered that he seriously believed that one cannot come out against Stalin. "Stalin is the only man who can still be obeyed". (Pearls, real pearls! The question is not what is the correct road, but rather of finding out who can be "obeyed" so that there shall not be any "bad" consequences.) Bucharin and Rykov are making a mistake if they think they will rule instead of Stalin. It is the Kaganovitches who will rule, and I do not want to and I will not obey Kaganovitch." (It is not true, he will obey Kaganovitch too.)

"Then what do you propose to do?"

"Well, I have been entrusted with the State Bank, and I will take care to see that there is money in the bank."

"As for me, I will not worry about scholars entering the N. T. U. (the Scientific-Technical Administration of which Kamenev is head) — that is no politics," said Kamenev. At this point they separated.

At the end of December, Zinoviev and Kamenev defined the situation as follows: "We must get at the helm. This can only be achieved if we support Stalin. Therefore no hesitation to pay him back the full price." (Poor fellows! They have already paid much but the rudder is still far off.) One of them (Kamenev, I think, went to Ordjonikidze. They talked a lot about the correctness of the present policy of the Central Committee. Ordjonikidze approved. When Kamenev declared that he could not understand why they were left in the Centro-Soyuz (where Zinoviev is working), Ordjonikidze replied: "It is still to early; the road must be opened. The Right will object." (And according to the resolution the Right is the principal enemy.) Kamenev said that it was not absolutely necessary to give him a high post, that the simplest thing would be to give him the Lenin Institute (But that is the main source of the Stalinist falsifications!), that they must be permitted to write for the press, etc. Ordjonikidze agreed and promised to raise the question in the Political Bureau.

Three days later Kamenev went to Voroshilov. For two hours he groveled before him, praised the policy of the Central Committee, to all of which Voroshilov did not reply with a single word. (For which he is to be commended.) Two days dater, Kalinin came to Zinoviev and stayed for twenty minutes. He brought news of the deportation of comrade Trotsky; when Zinoviev began to ask for details, he replied that the question was not yet decided and in the meanwhile it was not worth talking about. When Zinoviev asked about what was happening in Germany, Kalinin answered that he knew nothing: "We are up to our necks in our own affairs." Further, as if in reply to the visit of Kamenev to Voroshilov, he said literally as follows: "He (Stalin) babbles about left measures, but in a very short time he will be forced to apply a triple dose of my policy. That's why I support him." (That is correct! All his life Kalinin has never said and never will say anything more correct and appropriate.)

The Capitulators and the Deportation.

When the Zinovievists learned of the deportation of Trotsky, they came together. Bakaiev insisted that they come out with a protest. Zinoviev answered that there was no one to protest to, because "there is no master". (Then to whom does Zinoviev intend to pay the full price?) That is where the matter rested. The next day, Zinoviev went to Krupskaia and said that he had heard from Kalinin of the deportation of L. D. Kruskaia said that she had heard about it also.

"What do you intend to do with him?" asked Zinoviev.

"Firstly, you must not say **you**, but **they**, and secondly, even if we decide to protest who will listen to us?"

Zinoviev told her of the conversation of Kamenev with Ordjonikidze, of whom Krupskaia said: "Though he cries on everybody's shoulder, no confidence can be had in him."

Kamenev met Ordjonikidze who told him that he is publishing a work on the struggle against bureaucracy and he proposed that Kamenev aid him in it. Kamenev agreed with alacrity, whereupon Ordjonikidze invited him and Zinoviev to his house. During the visit little was said about his work. Ordjonikidze declared that he had raised the question in the Political Bureau and that Voroshilov had said: "No extension of their rights (that is, of Zinoviev and Kamenev.) Look what they want: the Lenin Institute! If they don't like the Centro-Soyuz, perhaps they can change to some other institution. As for printing their articles, that is not forbidden, but that does not mean that everything can be printed." (Oh, Voroshilov!)

"Well, and what did Stalin say?"

"Stalin said: "To extend their rights means to make a bloc. To make a bloc means to share half. I cannot share half. What will the Right say?" (But are not the Rights the "main enemy"?)

Kamenev: "Did he say just that in the Political Bureau?"

Ordjonikidze: "No, that was before the session."

Zinoviev and Stalin.

They left without anything coming of it. Zinoviev wrote a thesis two pages long (since Ordjonikidze did not help him, then a thesis must be written): "The Kulak is growing throughout the country, the Kulak does not give the worker's state any bread, the Kulak shoots at the village correspondents, at the officials and kills them. The Bucharin group, with is line, cultivates the Kulak; therefore, no support to Bucharin. Today we support the policy of the majority of the Central Committee (Stalin group), so long as Stalin fights against the Nepman, the Kulak and the Bureaucrat." (So Zinoviev has changed his mind: he no longer wants to pay the full price.) Kamenev says: "It is impossible to come to agreement with Stalin; to the devil with them all. Eight months from now I will publish a book on Lenin and then we shall see." Zinoviev is of a different mind. He says: "We must not be forgotten, we must appear at every meeting, in the press, and so forth, knock on every door, push the Party to the left." (In reality, no one has done as much harm to the left policy as Zinoviev and Kamenev.) And his articles are really published. After all, the editors of **Pravda** have completely adopted the advice of Voroshilov. They have again refused to publish one of his articles because it is said to express panic before the Kulak. In recent days Zinoviev has appeared at a Party meeting, in the Centro-Soyuz, in the Plechanov Institute and elsewhere to speak on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Communist International.

The Rights Dare to Criticize the Master!

After we had published the famous document (the conversation between Kamenev and Bucharin), Kamenev was called to Ordjonikidze's, where, after making certain reservations, (Hm! Hm!) he confirmed in writing the exactness of the report. Bucharin was also called to Ordjonikidze's and he confirmed it as well. On January 30 and on February 9th were held joint sessions of the Political Bureau and the presidium of the Central Control Commission. The Right declared that the leaflet was a "Trotskyite intrigue". They did not deny the fact of the conversation. They expressed their opinion that "the conditions for work are abnormal. Commissars — Krumin, Saveliev, Kaganovitch and others — have been put over members of the Political Bureau (Bucharin and Tomsky). The brother Parties are led by screaming at them. (Bucharin, Rykov and Tomsky have only now noticed that Stalin runs the "brother Parties" like an old Turkish Wali administered his province. It is no longer even necessary to scream at Thalmann and Semard; a crook of the finger is enough.) Twelve years after the Revolution there is not a single elected secretary of a Provincial Committee. The Party has no part in the solution of questions. Everything is done from above". These words of Bucharin were met with the cries: "Where did you copy that? From whom? From Trotsky!" A resolution to condemn Bucharin was proposed to the commission. But the Right refused to accept it, motivating their disagreement with the fact that they are already being "raked over the coals" enough in the districts.

At the joint session of the Political Bureau and the presidium of the Central Control Commission, Rykov read a long declaration of thirty pages, criticizing the economic situation and the inner-Party regime. At the Moscow provincial Party Conference, Rykov, Tomsky and Bucharin were openly designated as the Right. But very little was said of this in the press. The Plenum of the Central Committee has been postponed to April 16th, the conference to the 23rd. It has not been possible to achieve a conciliation between Stalin and the Bucharin group (although rumors to this effect are being insistently spread, doubtlessly in order that the nuclei shall defeat the Left wing.)

Moscow, March 20, 1929. — G. G.

IN THE NEXT ISSUE: The secret resolution adopted at the recent Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, preceding the 16th Party Conference. This resolution, passed by the Stalin faction, formally condemns Bucharin, Tomsky and Rykov and their platform. Neither this platform nor the secret resolution has been published or mentioned in the Stalinist press. Watch for its appearance in the next issue!

The Daily Worker Eats Crow

The Daily Worker of June 17, 1927 writes: "Trotsky's 'Letter to the Russian Workers' was printed in the United States in the New York "Nation", an organ of the liberal petty-bourgeoisesie, which has always stood in the way, hindering every real forward movement of the American working class. The 'Nation' printed Trotsky's scurrilous document under the pretense og being 'fair'. Under this cloak of 'fairness' they joined with the rest of the defamers of the First Workers' Republic in their task of undermining the Soviet Union. Needless to say the spirit of their so-called 'fairness' was not extended to the defenders of the U. S. S. R."

Oh, yes it was! And not so very long ago, either. Only a few months ago the Daily Worker reprinted with the greatest enthusiasm an article published in this same liberal petty-bourgeois Nation which consisted of a despicable, lying attack upon the Platform of the Bolshevik-Leninists and comrade Trotsky's exposure of the falsification of history by Stalin, printed in the book entitled "The Real Situation in Russia." The article was a book review which the philistine darling of the Stalinsts, Albert Rhys Williams was hired and paid for by the The Nation to write. When the Daily Worker reprinted his revolting trash from the columns of this same liberal, petty-bourgeois journal, the Nation was hailed by Minor like a companion-in-arms.

Putschism and May Day in Berlin

By Max Shachtman

In 1910, Herr von Jaegow, the Berlin police president, atempted to prohibit demonstrations on workers' May Day, and threatened to proceed against the demonstrants with arms if necessary. He was answered when hundreds of thousands of workers poured into the streets of Berlin as a challenge to the Junkers. Von Jaegow did not dare go through with his threat. But that which even the minions of the Kaiser did not dare to do, was left to be accomplished by the German social democracy, in the person of von Jaegow's successor in the post of Berlin's police president, Zoergiebel. Shortly before May 1st of this year, he issued an order prohibiting public demonstrations or meetings of any group in Berlin on May Day. The order was aimed directly at the Communists, and the answer of the Communist Party was a call to the workers of Berlin to fill the streets n May Day.

The prohibition had the unreserved support of the whole social democratic bureaucracy, both in its party and in the free trade unions. The task apparently cut out for the Communists was to mobilize the rank and file in the trade unions and the social democracy, as well as the workers sympathizing directly with the Communist Party, to demonstrate on May Day and break down Zoergiebel's edict under their crushing weight. In this task the present leadership of the German Party failed miserably, and with terrible consequences.

Into a Putschist Swamp.

Ensnared by the ultra-"left" course that the Party has pursued in recent months, self-deluded by the so-called "victories" in the factory councils' elections — gained at the expense of the most important positions of the Party had in the trade unions, intoxicated with exaggerated beliefs in its own strength and influence in the working class, and driven under the lash of the factional needs of Stalin in the Russian Party fight, the Thaelmann Central Committee was able to lead the party into what must be condemned as a putschist swamp. The enormity of the errors — not to say crimes — committed on May Day in Berlin in the name of the "third period" and the "new line" can only be indicated here by a few facts.

Throughout the city, preparations had been made by the trade unions for mass meetings in halls to celebrate May Day. It was the duty of the Party to send its members to these meetings, to take the floor, to call upon the workers to demonstrate in the streets in mass and thereby destroy the ukase of Zoergiebel. The overwhelming majority of the workers of Berlin were sure to be at those meetings, and as it appeared later, such was the case. It was essential to draw these broad masses of non-party and social democratic workers into this struggle so that it would not degenerate into a purely "vanguard" action.

With customary light-heartedness, the Party issued the slogan of boycotting these mass meetings under all circumstances. At the meeting of the Greater Berlin Central May Day Committee, the reporter who spoke for the Party, Kaspar, declared: "Can a revolutionary worker go where one of these traitors, a Severing, or a Hermann Mueller, is speaking? No! We must keep the workers from going there, we must get them to come to us." And further: "May first will be a general test for the coming civil war, both for the proletariat and for the police. If we do not succeed in getting hundred of thousands into the streets, a fascist terror regime will shortly break out in Germany that will be much worse than in Bulgaria and Italy." At this conference were present 60 delegates (!) represent ing chiefly small and medium factories, the Party and its auxiliary organizations. When a delegate from the Leninbund (Left Communists) spoke for participation in the trade union meetings with the aim of using them as starting points to mobilize the workers for demonstrations in the streets, he was howled dwn.

Into Zoergiebel's Trap.

It is with the fabulous idiocy of this May first in Berlin being "a general test for the coming civil war" of turning the backs of the Communists upon the centers where the masses were to gather, that the German Stalinists prepared to mobilize the workers against the prohibition of May Day. It is thus that they fell into the trap prepared for them by the provocation of Zoergiebel. They freed him of any fear that the reactionary police might have to club or shoot social democratic or non-party workers. Rarely have the social democratic murderers had such an opportunity of singing out and isolating Communist workers alone in the class struggle for butchery.

In its May Day number, the Rote Fahne, official organ of the party, wrote:

"The Communist Party, which has defeated reformism in the most important positions and will defeat it ever more decisively in its further advance, is growing with the broadest proletarian masses towards an indissoluble, invincible proletarian unity. In the trough between two waves of the revolution, in the ebb that followed the first stormy years of struggle of the post war period, there follows a new revolutionary tide. The first signals already annaunce the rumbling thunder of the future proletarian hurricane".

With such "revolutionary" phrase-mongering, the stage was all set for the May Day events; set by the experienced hand of Heinz Neumann, the personal agent of Stalin in Europe, the diseased creature who organized the putsch in Canton in 1927 from the safe distance of Hong-Kong.

The meetings called by the trade unions were every where more than filled by workers. But the Communists had surrendered these workers to the bureaucrats without a struggle. The Party had called for open demonstrations at the two most frequented centers: — Alexanderplatz and Potsdamer Platz, to be preceded by gatherings throughout the districts of the city. In those districts with little working class population, like Schoeneberg, Wilmersdorf and Charlottenburg, the Party meetings collapsed before they began. A few people appeared, numbering less than the Party membership in the district, a handful were arrested, and the Schupo (police) had an easy time of it. In the proletarian districts like Wedding, Schoenhauser Quarter, Osten, Neukoelln, and Kreuzberg there was a greater attendance, but still weak in relation to the population.

The Attack by the Police.

Long before the appointed time for the meetings, Schupo appeared armed with clubs and revolvers. The smaller meetings were immediately dispersed. In Weddingstrasse, they began to shoot into the windows of workers' homes at 10.30 A. M. Elsewhere, parades were held for a few hundred yards and then dispersed by the police. In some places, the police appeared for the first time with water pipes and hose to connect with hydrants for the purpose of spraying the demonstrants.

From noon onward, workers began to arrive at Alexanderplatz. At Potsdamer Platz there were less present than on that unforgettable day in 1916 when Karl Liebknecht spoke to the Berlin workers under a state of siege! For two hours the leaderless, unorganized, unprepared mass was jostled about by the Schupo who attacked those present with indiscriminate clubbings. Around Alexanderplatz, at Buelowplatz, Hackeschen Markt and Rosenthaler Tor, the police opened fire with the result that 9 were killed and many more wounded.

The Schupo proceeded most brutally in Wedding. In Koesliner Strasse, after beating demonstrants and passers-by with clubs, they began a fire that lasted for hours. A number of infuriated workers replied with rude barricades. The Schupo advanced with an armored car and machine guns. In some places the workers replied spontaneously by throwing stones at the police or shooting back with old service pistols. But there was no organized resistance to Zoergiebel's police. The latter continued to fire upon men and women, in the streets and through the windows of their homes, for three or four days, until 27 workers had been murdered, 75 seriously wounded and 200 others injured in the name of socialism and the Fatherland... Not a single policeman had been killed. Even some of the bourgeois papers called for an end to this ghastly slaughter engineered by the defenders of the republic, the social democrats.

The Party Continues With Self Delusions

The penalty of the Party for its ultra-"left" policies, however, were not yet paid in full. After the May Day events, the Communist Party declared in an appeal: "Why just in Berlin the bloody police terror of the bourgeoisie and Zoergiebel? Because in Berlin the Communists stand at the head of the workers' movement, because in Berlin the factory councils' elections showed that the overwhelming majority of the workers stands behind the Communist Party of Germany, because in Berlin the advance of the C. P. G. in the coming municipal elections will bring the liquidation of the social democracy and our overwhelming victory as the strongest Berlin party".

The theses of the Central Committee of the Party said: "The Berlin barricade fighters demonstrate that we are approaching an immediately revolutionary situation with whose development the question of the armed insurrection will inevitably appear on the order of the day... The Berlin May Day events signify a turning pont in the political development of Germany."

How much of the above is true and how much of it is rattle-brained fantasy can be judged from the following facts:

The workers unfortunately did not follow the leadership or line of the Party on May Day or afterward; they attended the meetings organized by the trade unions. With a very few exceptions, as in Treptow-Oberschoeneweide the Party meetings were miserably attended, they were headless, poorly organized and ill prepared. The Party "leaders", like Neumann, Dahlem, Remmele and Gerber were in evidence only as observers of the events, standing aside like good generals...

The workers followed the orders of the social democratic party and the trade union fakers. Where they were told to down tools on May Day, they did so. — Where they were told to continue at work they continued. The outstanding example of this was the case of the traction workers, where the Party recently achieved its great "victory" in the factory councils' elections by putting through its slate. Upon orders of the trade union bureaucrats the traction workers remained at their posts on May Day and traffic ran according to schedule with practically no interruption. On May 2nd, with the slaughter of the workers still going on, the employers were able to discharge the two chairmen of the subway employees' council — both of them communists elected at the recent vote — without a voice being raised for them, not to speak of a protest strike.

The Collapse of the Protest Strike.

Not a single large factory in Berlin followed the Party's call to demonstrate on May Day. On Thursday, May 2, a delegated conference was held under Party leadership to consider a general protest strike in Berlin. Only 45 delegates were present, representing only small and medium factories. Hoping for greater success, it reconvened the next noon, with only 300 in attendance It was again postponed until Friday evening, when 600 attended. The largest ted employed 600 workers, t' 400 down to 20 workers. A decision was reached to cal a general strike for the next day.

In this tense and pregnant situation in Berlin, where according to the manifesto of the Party "the overwhelming majrity of the workers stands behind the Communist Party of Germany", only from 20,000 to 25,000 workers responded to the call for a general strike. Another 25,000 went on strike in the rest of Germany, a total of 50,000 workers who followed this urgent call of the Communist Party to protest against the Berlin butchery!

There were no "barricade fighters", and roof fighting existed only in the imagination of the bourgeois press and the police. Shots were fired and stones thrown at the police by outraged workers who defended themselves against the Schupo provocations. There was no organized "barricade action" by the Party o the Red Front Fighters. The phrase-mongers had talked tall for weeks in the Party press. They talked abou the impending revolution, about the "general test fo the coming civil war", without making the slightes preparations for action, without mobilizing the masses of the workers, without making clear to the workers— or even the Party members — the intentions of the Party. When some workers and Party members acted spontaneously, the Party was nowhere to be found.— The Party leaders had committed the crime against which Lenin warned in his maxim: "Never play with insurrection."

After the pitiful collapse of the general strike, the Party began to agitate for a one-day strike in Berlin to honor the victims of the slaughter; then for a two hour strike; then for a 30 minute strike. But at th appointed time there was no cessation of work worth mentioning. At the burial a maximum of 2,000 people appeared.

The Defeat in Saxony.

Payment for the putsch policy of the Party leaders was again received in the Saxony elections that followed the May Day events. In the face of the growing radicalization of the German workers, exaggerated though it is by the Party, in face of the shamefu course pursued only a few days before by the socia democrats, the Communists not only failed to make gains, but they even lost ground. The vote stood, as compared with the vote in the 1928 Reichstag elections, as follows:

	1929	1928
Social Democrats	922,117	999,421
Communist Party	345,817	381,56

An even less favorable showing is evident by a comparison of the 1929 vote with the Saxony Landtag elections of 1926. Between these two elections, it is true, the Party gained 3,435 votes, but in the same period the social democrats won 164,112 votes. An even more ominous sign is the fact that the fascists almost quadrupled their previous vote.

These are heavy penalties to pay but they are always the burden of false policy. The burden is doubly heavy when it is brought on by adventurism and putschism. It will not become the lighter for the failure of the Party to estimate soberly and critically its course of action. Up to now there has been no real criticism in the ranks of the Party: there has only been bluff and false front, justification of what cannot and must not be justified.

The "Left" Zig-Zag of Centrism.

The Party is driving headlong on a reckless ultra-"left" path, towards adventurism, sectarianism and isolation. The Berlin putsch is Stalin's peculiar way of "correcting" the opportunist course along which he led the Comintern in the past few years. It is his method of adjusting the actions of the Communist Parties to the needs of his factional game against Bucharin and company. It is the "left" zig-zag of Centrism, the rudderles ship that is beaten alternately by waves on the left and the right.

We repeat that the German Party is heading towards opportunist isolation. It yielded to the dastardly provocations of the social democratic police president of Berlin. The words of the social democrats themselves show this better than anything else. In the Prussian Landtag, on May 13, the social democratic minister of the interior, Grzesinsky, said: "Had the prohibition of the demonstration been withdrawn before May 1st, it would have come to great clashes in Berlin between social democrats and Communists. That was the plan of the Communists, for then the police would have shot indiscriminately upon social democrats too, (These blackguards have little compunction about shooting social democratic workers! — M. S.) and then they would have accused the minister of the interior as a murderer of his own Party. That is why the police president acted quite correctly and quite wisely in not permitting the demonstration on May 1st."

This is confirmed by the words of Severing, the social democratic national minister of the Interior, in the Reichstag committee on May 7th: "it is the tas of the State to isolate the Communists."

The social democrats needed the provocation to assure the bourgeoisie that a coalition with them was safe. They needed it for the reparations conference in Paris as proof of their readiness to crush the militanc of the German proletariat. They needed it to deepen the chasm between the Communists and the social democratic workers. The false tactics of the Communis Party played complete into their hands.

The revolutionary movement in Germany has no been advanced by the May Day events — it has bee set back. The lost ground will be recovered only i there is a serious attempt to purge the Party of its op portunist-leftism. The evident intention of the Comintern to repeat the Berlin putsch on August 1st wi only retard this inevitable cleansing of the movemen

LOSOVSKY Versus LOSOVSKY

Despite the indications that the Stalinists are now preparing to make Losovsky the scapegoat for the catastrophic result of the new trade union line of the Comintern and the R. I. L. U. developed in the "third period", the fact remains that Losovsky's only crime was that he followed the "new line" to its logical conclusion. Unfortunately, the essence of the ultra-"left" infantile disease of the Comintern's new trade union line remains. Losovsky was the most "consistent" spokesman and advocate of this line, the sheer senselessness of which can be best demonstrated by comparing Losovsky today with Losovsky (and the line of the International) yesterday.

"Can it be seriously maintained", writes Losovsky in The Communist International, Vol. VI, Nos. 9-10, "that the American Federation of Labor represents an advantage to the workers' movement of the United States? Or, possibly, the All-German Federation of Trade Unions, which has shattered one revolutionary movement after another, is an advantage to the German proletariat? Would it not have been better for German proletariat if that strike-breakers' organization had not existed in November, 1918? One would have thought so. And if that is so, it is quite obvious that the Communists who construct their tactics on such an estimate of the reformists trade unions are closer to the social democrats than the Communists."

And further: "We must not forget that the section of the workers organized by the social democrats is the most reactionary section of the proletariat."

THE LOSOVSKY OF YESTERDAY

This is the "new line" for trade union work that the world Communist movement is required to swallow without as much as a gasp. But Losovsky, not to mention others, wrote differently on the same subject some time ago. Replying to the very nonsense that he advances above, he said in his book "The World's Trade Union Movement" (pages 84-85):

"Basing themselves upon the unions, former members of the social democratic party, such as Noske, shot down thousands of workers. All this brought about pessimism and despair in the more revolutionary and impatient German workers. From that was created a whole theory: The old trade unions are rotten through and through; they are reactionary, and in order successfully to fight the bourgeoisie it is necessary to destroy them completely. If this colossal apparatus is being used against the revolution if it is so entwined with the bourgeois state, it is necessary to destroy it before the power of labor can be established.

"In deciding upon our line of action in this regard we followed the Comintern which was categorically opposed to the theory of destroying the unions, but was for winning them over. Why? Did we not equally estimate the reactionary character of the trade unions? Did we not recognize the fact of the interlacing of the bourgeois state with the heads of the trade unions? Did we not see their reactionary role? Certainly, we saw all that, but we are approaching the trade unions from an entirely different point of view than our German comrades then were.

"There was another reason why we were opposed to that slogan. What does it mean to consider the trade unions as 'hopeless' in the revolutionary sense (as Losovsky does now!) If the nine million workers of Germany are 'hopeless' (or the most reactionary section of proletariat, as Losovsky says today), then the revolution itself is 'hopeless'. Thus, we come to unexpected conclusions which are of a Menshevik nature."

THE "NEW LINE" IN THE UNITED STATES

It would be purely academic to make these quotations to prove the instability of Losovsky, were it not for the fact that the application of this "new line" in the United States and elsewhere is bringing the greatest harm to the working class movement as whole and the Communist movement in particular. In the United States, where the trade union question is especially difficult, the application of the present reckless and non-Leninst line threatens to play increased havoc with the movement. The American Stalinites of all shades who accomodate themselves to every twist and quirk of the international factional apparatus, who drop old "lines" and adopt new ones with the utmost nonchalance, may give little heed to the consequences of their acts. But we will continue to criticize the present trade union line of the Party until its distortions are eliminated.

The Party is wrong in its course toward the formation of a new "revolutionary trade union center" at the Cleveland conference of the T. U. E. L. Without fully understanding it, the membership of the Party is being dragged into another Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance. We are for the formation of a broad left wing opposition movement, with the necessary centralization, to fight to win the workers in the trade unions and not to surrender them to the A. F. L. fakers.

The Party is wrong in its attitude towards the progressive movement. The Party poiusly and indignantly points out some of the leaders of this movement (and correctly, of course) as reactionaries, as vacillators, as turncoats, and thinks that thereby the problem is solved. Unfortunately, there are many workers following the Mustes and Maurers who lead only because there is progressive pressure from below, a pressure that is sure to grow. The Party does not see workers; it sees only the leaders and remains pious and indignant.

THE "UNITED FRONT WITH ONE'S SELF"

The Party is wrong in its attitude toward the united front, which has today become a parade slogan, trotted out for show and nor for daily applicati- The Party follows the cours in this question that was correctly criticized by Losovsky (in 1926—not today!): "The united front with one's self. A quite noteworthy formula which unfortunately corresponds to the fact in some cases. It is the result of the tactic of self-isolation. Since in many cases it is only too difficult to bridge the cleavage between the social democratic and Communist workers, the attempt is made to choose conveniently the line of least resistance, that is, instead of building the united front with the workers of other tendencies, the united front between Communists in various organizations is set up. But this is not one and the same thing, or to speak more exactly, absolutely not the same thing." (Communists and Trade Unions, Berlin, 1926, page 65.) The Party cannot pass off as a genuine attempt at united front activity a conference composed of the unions directly controlled by the Party, plus the regular standbys — from Party-controlled singing societies to swimming clubs.

The Party is wrong in arbitrarily withdrawing left wing minority groups or organizations from the A. F. of L. for the purpose of achieving temporary and illusory "victories", instead of stubbornly fighting for their retention in the old unions as a militant opposition. It was wrong to withdraw the left wing millinery workers' locals from the A. F. of L. union and add them to the Needle Trades Workers Idustrial League Union, without continuing the fight bitterly against the expulsion tactics of the Zaritskys. It is wrong tactics to split off the Elizabethton local of the United Textile Workers Union instead of organizing it as an opposition nucleus within the U. T. W. to fight against the fakers and for the unification of the textile workers. The slogan for the Communists is Unity. The responsibility for all splits and division must be placed squarely and indisputably on the reactionaries. The Resolutions and Decisions of the Second Congress R. I. L. U. (Profintern) says: "Insofar as there are in the reformists unions organized minorities in sympathy with the C. G. T. U. (the French left-wing union) the latter should not create rival organizations. The adherents of the R. I. L. U. should systematically organize their groups within the reformists unions and should carry on a struggle for unity within and without." This holds good today. Jouhaux is neither better nor worse than Sigman or Green.

THE NEEDLE TRADES SITUATION

The Party is wrong in the course it pursues at the present stage of the struggle in the needle trades. The position of the left wing union in the present "strike maneuvers" of the right wing union is practically a boycottist attitude. The left denounces the maneuver as a "fake stoppage" and says that if a strike takes place, it will call upon its supporters to walk out also and to proceed to the left wing union headquarters. What the left wing should do **now**, however, is to begin to agitate for a strike and for **united action on the part of both left and right unions to win that strike.** If the left wing is capable of rising to its tasks it will mobilize the sentiment of the workers in the ranks of both unions and those who stand outside of either union. That is the path towards uniting the workers and at the same time strengthening the left wing. That the right wing fakers will not want to unite will only make it worse for them. Here again the Second Congress of the R. I. L. U. says: "In their attempt to extend and internally strengthen the revolutionary organizations they should always bear in mind that their chief task is to organize concerted actions of all workers' organizations..... To take into consideration that in countries in which there are several trade union headquarters, every action of the workers, particularly in the event of the general strike, is threatened with great danger, if the trade unions will not fight jointly. Therefore, the revolutionary trade union officials should take upon themselves the initiative to create the united front." This line was correct then and is now.

All these proposals and criticism may sound strange and novel to the fascinated adherents of the new Stalin-Losovsky line. All that is strange about it is the facility with which the Stalinized Parties have discarded the Leninists tactics.

THE YOUNG PLAN

The Dawes Plan placed a rope around the necks of the German masses. The Young and Morgan Plan, through the International Bank of Settlements, aims to extend and tighten this rope around the necks of the workers throughout the world.

The Young Plan replaces and extends the Dawes Plan for the payment of reparations by the German Government to the Allies and the United States Government. The German capitalists of course pass on the payments to the German toilers. The total amount of reparations to be paid and the time in which they are to be paid is definitely fixed in the Young Plan. This was not the case with the Dawes Plan.

Approximately $400,000,000 a year is to be paid by the Allies to America for a period of 58 years, from August 31st, 1929 to March 31st, 1988, to cover the debts contracted by the Allies to the United States in the World War.

How German Workers must be squeezed.

The Plan calls for special payments in the first 37 years by Germany of an amount totalling $7,826,868,000. The grand total to be paid by the sweating German masses, including the past five months under the Dawes Plan, is 36,996,000,000 Marks (about $8,879,040,000).

The new and important feature in connection with the payments of the reparations and the war debts and the future plans is that a special institution, the International Bank of Settlements, is thereby set up through which all payments by Germany are to be made instead of directly to the Governments involved as hitherto. It will take the place of the existing machinery for the reparations collections. 65 percent of the payments will go to cover war debt payments to the United States by the former Allies; the other 35 percent will go to repair war damages, chiefly in France. The International Bank of Settlements will transfer the German marks paid by the Reich into credits for the acount of the central banks of England, France and Italy. These nations can then draw on such credits for payment of their debts to the United States Government. The resources of the German railroads are pledged for Germany's payments.

Formally the United States has no hand in the entire matter; it concerns only the "Europe Powers". Actually the United States Government, carrying out the will of Wall Street, is the main force that has brought about the new plan and the International Bank, and it will use every agency at its command to enforce action and payments.

The Bank is meant to be a permanent institution which will continue to exist after the reparations have been disposed of. That is only its initial business. After wringing Germany's neck by controlling its foreign exchange and production it is meant to spread farther. It is meant to become a real factor in world trade. Its profits are expected to run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

A Center for World Exchange.

While it is transferring the billions of German marks into Germany's payments on the reparations accounts, it will endeavor to gather for itself business in other exchanges and to become the logical handler of most of the world's exchange business. Morgan, Young and Company no doubt intend that it shall become an institution controlling most of the gold of the world. To begin with it has, according to the report, 500 million dollars worth of marks to sell annually, and it is expected that an odd $400,000,000 an- ransferred to Washington. This in itself is a tremendous lever; the control over such movements of wealth is not to be minimized.

Formally America is not directly represented on the board of directors. England on the other hand plays a very prominent and formal role in the International Bank. England helps to collect reparations: America "only" receives. That England plays such a role is evidence that English capital aspires to continue as a major financial world power. That the United States plays its game indirectly shows its confidence over the situation and its real power. It also serves to establish somewhat the present relation of forces between the two greatest capitalist powers now contesting for the control of the world's available markets.

The International Bank, seemingly is to act as an ordinary bank conducting commercial, industrial and economic undertakings. But the formation of such an international institution at this time cannot be separated from the present world situation of economic, financial and political instability for capitalism.

Capitalism also undoubtedly has in mind, through the International Bank, to draw the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics into its orbit as one of the few remaining markets of consequence. What capitalism could not accomplish through military intervention and war up till now it hopes to achieve through the pressure of international economy. The imperialists also hope by the new plan to draw Germany away from the Soviet Union and to unite more closely all countries against Russia. Thus the possibilities of a war offensive against the Soviet Republics are increased. The military threat is inevitably coupled wth the economic threat and pressure against Russia.

False Hopes for Stabilization.

The authors of the International Bank hope to stabilize the shaky capitalist economy, exploit more intensively the existing markets and reorganize the existing and available ones under domination of Wall Street. The Plan itself says quite plainly:

"In the natural course of development it is to be expected that the bank will become an organization, not simply or even predominantly, concerned with the handling of reparations, but also with furnishing to the world of international commerce and finance important facilities hitherto lacking."

"It is to be hoped", says the Plan, "that it will become an increasingly close and valuable link in the cooperation of central banking institutions generally — a cooperation essential to the continuing stability of the world's credit structure."

So say and hope Morgan and Company. But "stability" for the capitalists is multiplied misery for the workers. The last word is yet to be spoken and it will be spoken by the workers. The International Bank cannot solve the problem of new markets. The United States and Britain cannot absorb all the gold and payments in kind that are to be made. The International Bank in due time will only aggravate the crisis of capitalism and compel the working class of the world to fight for its overthrow. The exposure of the Young Plan by the Communists and the struggle against it are a necessary part of the preparation for this.

TROTSKY THE MILLIONARE

"For these lies and calumnies the English pay to Trotsky hundreds of thousands of dollars." — Rojkov, "a Russian worker" in the Daily Worker, June 3, 1929.